

ON SOME GERMAN AND GERMANIC OV COMPOUNDS

One of the central issues in recent linguistic study is that raised by Hugo Moser in the introduction to his collection of papers on German grammar: primacy of attention to meaning or to form (Moser 1962: 1-2). In the terms of his statement the problem concerns an 'inhaltsbezogene' versus a 'gestaltbezogene' approach to the study of language. This issue has continued to be prominent, as in the current opposition of generative semantics versus generative syntax. Such issues can be illuminated by examining crucial linguistic data. This paper examines selected compounding processes at several points in the history of the Germanic languages, with a view to their formation and their position in the grammar.

If compounding is accounted for in accordance with a formal approach, productive compounds of a specific language will be formed in accordance with the normal patterns of arrangement and selection in that language. (Since I am not concerned here with the surface forms of Germanic compounds, I take no note of the further syntactic means: modulation and modification.) If on the other hand compounding is accounted for in accordance with a semantic approach, presumably any compounding pattern of meaningful constituents would be possible.

Linguists have concerned themselves extensively with compounds, noting the problems involved in accounting for them; see Fleischer (1969) and Marchand (1969) for surveys of the material and the publication in reference to German and English. Citing one pair of compounds, Hirt called attention to the difference between order of the elements in the German and French words for *railroad*, suggesting that this order is determined by "deep causes": 'Die beiden Verbindungen d. *Eisenbahn* und frz. *chemin de fer* bieten einen Gegensatz, der zweifellos auf sehr tiefliegenden Ursachen beruht' (Hirt 1928:15). Whether these deep-seated causes are to be viewed as related to content or to form he did not state. It will be assumed here that the causes are related to form. By this view productive compounding in language is regulated by formal principles, though the morphemes involved are restricted by their lexical properties.

If compounds are produced in accordance with formal syntactic structures, the procedures involved must be more precisely specified than they have been in linguistic treatments of the past, even admirable monographs like that of Jacobi (1897; see also Marchand 1969, esp. 55-57). It is now clear that the primary relationships between essential elements of sentences are regulated by a principle which governs the arrangements concerned. If in a language objects are consistently placed after verbs, nominal modifiers follow nouns. Moreover, verbal qualifiers precede verbs. On the other hand if objects are consistently placed before verbs, nominal modifiers precede nouns and verbal qualifiers follow verbs. The principle is illustrated most clearly with consistent VO languages like Irish and consistent OV languages like Japanese, in which the position of subjects does not interfere with that of modifiers of either verbs or nouns. For Irish has the verb initially in the clause; it belongs to the sub-group of VO languages which is VSO in structure. Japanese has verb final position, as do all OV languages. In Irish then nominal modifiers like relative constructions, attributive genitival and adjectival constructions are placed after nouns; in Japanese they are placed before nouns. Moreover, by the principle noted above the interrogative and sentence-negative qualifiers are placed before verbs in Irish, after them in Japanese. Evidence with examples has been given in numerous articles (Greenberg 1966, Lehmann 1971, 1972, 1973). The principle then provides an explicit statement for examining productive compounding in a given language.

If Hirt's French and German examples are interpreted in accordance with the principle, the cause for their difference in arrangement can be stated. French, by contrast with German, is a consistent SVO language; adjectives, genitives and relative constructions are consistently placed after nouns. German on the other hand normally places adjectives before nouns, though genitives and relative constructions are placed after nouns; see however Lehmann 1971 on the preposed adjectival modifier constructions of German and their implications. The rules for compounding in French would then be expected to yield constructions like *chemin de fer*. German on the other hand might well be expected to have compounds like *Eisenbahn*. For in consistent VO languages like French attributive elements are placed after the modified element; in German, as noted above, they may be placed before it.

Apart from the maintenance of the OV arrangement for descriptive adjectives, which German shares with English and other northern Indo-European languages, German is unusually interesting because it requires the VO arrangement in one fundamental linguistic pattern, the independent clause, the OV in another, the dependent clause. The resultant variation in syntactic structures has led on the one hand to the labeling of German as OV in deep structure (Bach 1962) and on the other as VO (Ross 1970). Rather than the rigid atemporal view of language which was prominent in linguistics when these labels were applied to German, a view recognizing the fluid structure of every language permits an understanding of contrasting patterns like those in standard German independent versus dependent clauses.

The prenominal position of adjectives as well as the OV order of dependent clauses can be accounted for historically. Of these constructions the OV order of dependent clauses is particularly significant, for its time of incorporation into the language can be identified. Verb final position was adopted around 1500 (Behaghel 1932:20 - 22). This clause arrangement was gradually recognized more generally as a rule of German syntax, and accordingly also used more widely in the colloquial as well as the learned language. In view of this remarkable situation, by which the incorporation of a fundamental syntactic pattern can be detected, German can illuminate the processes involved in patterns of arrangement and their change. For the OV clause structure led to other syntactic changes, such as the preposing of adjectival modifiers and the introduction of postpositions (Lehmann 1971).

If arrangement of syntactic elements was affected, innovations might also be expected in the construction of compounds, as noted above. For productive compounds are generated in accordance with basic syntactic patterns of arrangement, as may be illustrated by recalling the compounds of Proto-Indo-European and the early dialects. In Proto-Indo-European there were two major kinds of compounds, synthetics such as Vedic Sanskrit *go-dā-* 'giving cattle, making cattle as presents' and bahuvrihis or possessives, such as *gṛ-magha-* 'having an abundance of cattle' (Risch 1944-49:5). Both kinds reflect the sentence structure of Proto-Indo-European, which was OV. In synthetics the object, e.g. *go-* 'cattle', is placed before the verb, *dā-* 'give', in accordance with the Proto-Indo-European object-verb arrangement of clauses. In the bahuvrihis, the first element specifying the second, e.g. *go-* 'cattle', is placed before the substantival element indicating the item or quantity possessed, e.g. *magha-* 'abundance'; the possessive meaning is based on the Proto-Indo-

European syntactic pattern indicating possession (Lehmann 1969). Besides the predominant productive patterns, compounding, like other linguistic constructions, may be found in marked patterns; thus in the well-known compound names of early Indo-European the marked order of object and verb is used, yielding compounds like Gk. *Arkhlēaos* '(he) rules people, chief'. These are found as proper names or epithets.

In the dialects, including Germanic, the major types of Proto-Indo-European compounds became less and less prominent. New compounding patterns are to be expected if we assume that the types of compounds produced will change when a language changes its patterns of sentence construction. Late Proto-Indo-European was developing to a VO structure, the syntactic pattern of arrangement also of most of the dialects. After this change the productive compounds had the first element modify the second, rather than governed by it, as in the earlier synthetics. Already in Classical Sanskrit the majority of compounds were dependent and descriptive, e.g. *pādodaka* 'foot-water, water for the feet' and *priyasakhi* 'dear friend'. Moreover, these are endocentric unlike the Proto-Indo-European exocentric bahuvrihis, for example Gothic *naudipaurfts*, Old Swedish *nödtharft*, Old High German *nōtduruft* 'pressing need' and Gothic *midjungards*, Old Norse *miðgarðr*, Old High German *mittingard* 'middle kingdom, earth.' The data are presented in Carr (1939:40-68).

Yet Germanic, like the other dialects, retained some OV compounds of the bahuvrihi pattern, as may be illustrated by OHG *wuotanherz* 'grim-heart, tyrant' and ON *ánfēte* 'one-footed' (Carr 1939: 169-174). But the Germanic adjectival bahuvrihis are not made simply of basic noun and verb roots like the Vedic compounds; rather, they have adjectival suffixes, e.g. *-ja-* < PIE *-yo-*, as do also late bahuvrihis in other dialects, such as Latin *bipedius* 'two-footed,' Sanskrit *daśa-padya* 'comprising ten padas' and Greek *homopātrios* 'having the same father.' Other suffixes were used in the same way, such as OHG *-ig* < *-ikos* in OHG *sibunjārig* 'seven years old' (Carr 1939:165, Brugmann 1906: 112-114). These compounds are endocentric; they have come to be comparable to the modifier : modified compounds characteristic of Germanic, such as OHG *tagalieht*, NHG *Tageslicht* 'daylight.' Since the suffixes *-yo-* and *-iko-* make adjectives indicating the 'pertinence or relationship' of one thing to another (Debrunner 1917: 199) the remodeled bahuvrihis merge with attributives in Germanic, as they did in other dialects. OHG compounds like *sibunjārig* and *einöugig* 'one-eyed' are comparable with MHG

einvaltec, MHG *müesalic*, NHG *mühselig* (Henzen 1957: 78-81, 196-199), or even to simplexes like *bäufig*; *bäufig* itself may be translated as 'having frequency' as well as 'frequent' but this is a labored interpretation. The *-ig* forms have become adjectives quite different in formation from the earlier bahuvrihi compounds. The nominal bahuvrihis which are attested and expanded in German belong to certain semantic classes: names of plants, animals and humans. The restricted semantic sphere even of new compounds, such as German *Dickkopf* 'fat-head, meat-head' (Paul 1920: 30), suggests that these compounds are made on the pattern of others rather than based on syntactic clause patterns of the language. Any compounds which the Germanic languages may have maintained on the Proto-Indo-European patterns, such as *Adalheit* '(woman having) noble characteristics,' are relic formations, as is most clearly indicated by citing meaningless compounds like the OHG name *Wolfdag*. Such forms illustrate that the principles of compounding in Old High German were no longer like those of Proto-Indo-European; they furnish such evidence in much the same way that Modern English compounds like *fishburger* illustrate different compounding principles than those used in Modern German to form adjectives from city names like *Hamburg* with the suffix *-er*.

The production of compounds in later stages of the Germanic languages can be accounted for. In the major classes of New High German compounds the first element modifies the second, in accordance with the Adjective: Noun construction maintained through all periods of the language; examples are *Buchbinder* 'bookbinder'—a specific kind of 'binder'; *freigebig* 'liberal'—a specific kind of attitude to giving; *lustwandeln* 'stroll for pleasure' and so on. Yet in contrast with such long-established major compound types New High German has a small number of verbal compounds which are of the OV pattern, such as *formgeben* and *haushalten* (Paul 1920: 39-43, Fleischer 1969: 282). In these examples the initial nominal element has a relationship of 'effizientes' accusative object to the second verbal element; examples of other relationships will be cited below. The compound type is then comparable to that of Vedic *go-dā-* 'give cattle.' One would expect such compounds to arise only in an OV language.

In accounting for the German compounds the time of their origin is important, for it may lead to an understanding of their basis. These compounds are attested only after the early New High German period.

Trübner 3.360 labels *formgeben* a 'frühnhd. Zusammenrückung.' And *haus-*

halten is classified by Paul-Betz (1966:295) as 'keine eigentliche Zus., sondern nur Zusammenschreibung des Obj. mit dem regierenden Verb.' Yet it is difficult to deny that *haushalten* is a compound, for the entry goes on to identify *Haushalt* as a back formation from the verb. Besides such direct information on the time of origin of these compounds, indirect evidence may be based on observations concerning new compound formations. Debrunner distinguishes 'ältere und jüngere Komposition' with virtually the same terms as that used by Paul-Betz. According to him: 'Man hat daher immer verschiedene Schichten von Komposita zu unterscheiden. Die jüngern unterscheiden sich von den ältern gewöhnlich durch größere Durchsichtigkeit des lautlichen und morphologischen Bildes und der syntaktischen Beziehungen: sie sind meist mehr "Zusammenrückungen" als eigentliche "Zusammensetzungen"' (1917:16). Such indirect evidence accordingly indicates that the compounds in New High German of the OV pattern are relatively recent (see also Paul 1920:39). New compounding patterns may in turn be associated with new clause patterns.

Such a new clause pattern is indeed documented for New High German. The OV word order of dependent clauses, as Behaghel and others have demonstrated, was fixed about 1500. In an earlier essay I have proposed that this innovation led to the introduction of other OV constructions, notably postpositions and preposed relative constructions (Lehmann 1971). Both the postpositions and the preposed modifier constructions came to be increasingly prominent in subsequent centuries, as documented in grammars and dictionaries. Attempts were not made however to account for these new constructions, in accordance with the restricted aims of previous grammars. Insights into linguistic developments permit us to suggest explanations for at least some syntactic developments. Among these is the production of new compounds, such as the OV compounds of New High German which are discussed here.

I suggest that this compounding pattern was introduced in accordance with the OV order of dependent clauses. The elements of these compounds may well have been used earlier in predicates, as was *wett-* as the nominal element of verbal phrases. The creation of new verbal compounds with *wett-* as the nominal element however is attested only after the fixing of the OV subordinate clause pattern: *wettrennen* is documented from the sixteenth century (Grimm, Dt. Wb. 14.1.2.787); *wettmachen* also from the sixteenth, as a single verb (783-785); *wetteifern* from the seventeenth (687). Established

when the OV clause pattern was introduced in dependent clauses, this pattern for compounds has subsequently been the basis of other such compounds. The data are summarized in Fleischer (1969: 282); they may also be determined from dictionaries like that of Mater, who lists for *halten* the following compounds: *haushalten*, *inganghalten*, *schritthalten*, *standhalten*, *stichhalten*, *worthalten*. The compounds with *fehl-* as first member are so common that Fleischer labels it a prefix (1969:282).

Moreover, the relationship between the nominal element and the verb varies, as Fleischer has pointed out; this may be verb plus object, as in *kegelschieben*; verb plus instrument, as in *maschineschreiben*; verb plus noun of purpose, as in *schaustellen*; verb plus manner, as in *kettenrauchen*, and so on. The variety of relationships indicates that the pattern is well-established.

In accordance with the established pattern verbs are derived from nouns with the pattern object : verb, even though the noun consisted of an adjectival element modifying the second component, as in *buchbindern*, *moorbaden*, *rundfunken* and others (Fleischer 1969:287). These verbs are relatively recent, as indicated by their tendency to be restricted to the non-finite forms. Moreover, when used as finite forms, they tend to be limited to subordinate clauses, in which they have the same arrangement as would the separate elements (Grebe 1966:§3975, §4400). Though distinct in origin, and to some extent in syntactic usage, from the earlier compounds made up of noun and verb, such as *wetteifern*, these later compounds are of the same structure, and presumably will also come to be used in syntactic patterns which do not maintain the order noun verb, as noted by Grebe (§4400) for *notlanden*, *notschlachten*, *schutzimpfen*. The OV pattern of these verbal compounds has apparently become as well-established in New High German as has the OV arrangement of subordinate clauses, and in accordance with the hypothesis followed here is attributable to that pattern.

If syntactic constructions like compounds are indeed introduced in accordance with clause patterns, other examples of innovations in compound types should be identified. One such pattern may well be that of Old Norse noun: adjective compounds which were comparable in meaning to bahuvrihi. Examples are: *bein-stórr* 'bigboned,' *báls-langr* 'long-necked,' *hand-fagr* 'having fair hands,' *bug-góðr* 'kind-hearted,' *móð-rakkr* 'fierce,' *nas-bráðr* 'snarling, hot-headed,' *orð-góðr* 'speaking well of everybody,' and many others. These compounds have noun: adjective order in contrast with the typical Germanic bahuvrihi compounds, such as Old Norse *blá-eygr* 'blue-

eyed' (Kluge 1913: 231-232), Gothic *haub-bairts*, OE *hēab-beort*, OE *hēab-mōd*, OHG *bōb-muote* 'proud.' As these examples indicate, in the typical Germanic compounds the first element modifies the second. The contrasting noun: adjective bahuvrihis of Old Norse, in which the second element specifies the first, must be innovations occasioned by the influence of an OV language.

But if these compounds are attributed to OV influence, other evidence for such influence should be adduced, that is, other OV constructions introduced into Old Norse after the Proto-Germanic period. Striking evidence for such influence is given by the loss of verbal prefixes; this led to the metrical insertion of *of*, *um* in verse. The phenomena were thoroughly documented and described, but not accounted for until recently (Lehmann 1970, also for bibliography). Since OV languages do not have prefixes, the remarkable loss of prefixes in Old Norse must have resulted from influence of an OV language. The noun: adjective bahuvrihi compounds can also be attributed to this influence. This explanation then is preferable to the possible assumption that the Old Norse noun: adjective compounds may be attributed to marked patterns, inasmuch as some of them are epithets, e.g. *hār-fagr* 'fair-haired.'

Whatever the views on the explanations proposed here for the compounding patterns discussed, compounds must be related to other syntactic constructions in their language. In further explorations of their introduction and their formation they must be accounted for syntactically, not simply described for their morphological characteristics. Such explanations can only be provided on the basis of comprehensive data and thorough descriptive analyses, such as those made available in Germanic linguistics by Hugo Moser.

Bibliography

- Bach, Emmon. 1962. The order of elements in a transformational grammar of German. *Language* 38. 263 - 269.
- Behaghel, Otto. 1932. *Deutsche Syntax*, Bd. IV. Heidelberg: Winter.
- Brugmann, Karl. 1906. *Grundriß der vergleichenden Grammatik der indogermanischen Sprachen*. 2. *Lehre von den Wortformen und ihrem Gebrauch*. 1. Straßburg: Trübner.

- Carr, Charles T. 1939. Nominal Compounds in Germanic. London: Oxford University Press.
- Debrunner, Albert. 1917. Griechische Wortbildungslehre. Heidelberg: Winter.
- Fleischer, Wolfgang. 1969. Wortbildung der deutschen Gegenwartssprache. Leipzig: VEB Bibliographisches Institut.
- Grebe, Paul. 1966. Grammatik der deutschen Gegenwartssprache. 2nd ed. Mannheim: Bibliographisches Institut.
- Greenberg, Joseph H. 1966. Some Universals of Grammar with Particular Reference to the Order of Meaningful Elements, pp. 73 - 113 of Universals of Language, ed. J.S. Greenberg. 2nd ed. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Grimm, Jacob und Wilhelm. 1854-1957. Deutsches Wörterbuch. Leipzig.
- Henzen, Walter. 1965. Deutsche Wortbildung. 3d ed. Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- Hirt, Hermann. 1928. Indogermanische Grammatik IV. Doppelung Zusammensetzung Verbum. Heidelberg: Winter.
- Jacobi, Hermann G. 1897. Compositum und Nebensatz. Bonn: Cohen.
- Kluge, Friedrich. 1913. Urgermanisch. 3d ed. Straßburg: Trübner.
- Lehmann, W.P. 1969. Proto-Indo-European Compounds in Relation to other Proto-Indo-European Syntactic Patterns. Acta Linguistica Hafniensia 12. 1-20.
- . 1970. The Nordic languages: lasting linguistic contributions of the past. The Nordic Languages and Modern Linguistics, ed. by Hreinn Benediktsson, 286 - 305. Reykjavík: Vísindafélag Íslendinga.
- . 1971. On the rise of SOV patterns in New High German. Grammatik Kybernetik Kommunikation, ed. by K.G. Schweisthal, 19 - 24. Bonn: Dümmler.
- . 1972. Contemporary Linguistics and Indo-European Studies. PMLA 87. 976 - 993.
- . 1973. A Structural Principle of Language and its Implications. Language 49. 47 - 66.
- Marchand, Hans. 1969. The Categories and Types of Present-Day English Word-Formation. 2nd ed. München: Beck.
- Mater, Erich. 1967. Rückläufiges Wörterbuch der deutschen Gegenwartssprache. 2nd ed. Leipzig: VEB Verlag Enzyklopädie.
- Moser, Hugo. 1957. Deutsche Sprachgeschichte der älteren Zeit. Deutsche Philologie im Aufriß, Bd. I. 621 - 854, hsgb. v. Wolfgang Stammer. Berlin: Schmidt.
- . Hsgb. 1962. Das Ringen um eine neue deutsche Grammatik. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchhandlung.

Paul, Hermann. 1920. Deutsche Grammatik, Bd. V. Wortbildungslehre. Halle: Niemeyer.

Paul, Hermann/Werner Betz. 1966. Deutsches Wörterbuch. 5th ed. Tübingen: Niemeyer.

Risch, Ernst. 1944-48. Griechische Determinativ-Komposita. Indogermanische Forschungen 59. 1 - 61, 245 - 94.

Ross, John R. 1970. Gapping and the Order of Constituents. Progress in Linguistics, ed. M. Bierwisch, K.E. Heidolph, 249 - 259. The Hague: Mouton.

Trübners Deutsches Wörterbuch. Berlin. 1939 - 1957.

A part of the research for this study was carried out under support from Contract F30602-74-Q-018 with Rome Air Development Center.